

equipped with the best scientifically trained men obtainable, and with the best modern applicances, for the investigation of agricultural botanical problems.—FREDERICK V. COVILLE, *Washington, D. C.*

THE FLORA OF ALABAMA.

To the Editors of the Botanical Gazette: Having just returned from a three months' trip through the north my attention was called yesterday (Sept. 4) for the first time to the severe criticism of my bulletin in the BOTANICAL GAZETTE issued in July. The article would give me little concern but for the unjust charge that I had treated Dr. Mohr with unfairness because he "granted me a favor that has been abused." Eliminate this feature of the "review" and there is little for me to complain of. The article of which I complain is so cruelly unjust and there is such a tone of keen sarcasm pervading the entire paragraph I cannot refrain from entering my protest and demanding at least a fair statement of the facts. There is the most friendly relationship existing between Dr. Mohr and myself, and if there has been any complaint on his part of slight or "favor abused," I am yet to hear of it. A careful reading of the bulletin will show that I have been very punctilious in giving Dr. Mohr ample credit for all the assistance he has rendered me; not only after each species is his name printed, but on page 279 the following occurs: "The author acknowledges with pleasure material assistance from Dr. Chas. Mohr of Mobile in locating many of the species mentioned in this bulletin." In several instances his name is given alone, although I had also gathered specimens in the same county. It seems to me there is no injustice done Dr. Mohr in giving him credit for all information secured from him, and there can be no interference with his proposed work on the botany of Alabama, since my bulletin is simply a list of localities and nothing more, while his book will give full details in all matters relating to the plant. I am confident from what I know of Dr. Mohr he cannot consider my list as antagonistic to his work. Before publishing my bulletin I sent the list of species to Dr. Mohr and requested him to examine it carefully and give me the names of other counties if possible. I stated in my letter that it was my intention to publish the list as one of the bulletins of the state station, and I would like to get his consent to use his information. In reply to this letter he not only gave me the additional counties asked for, but was kind enough to add a few other species to my list (he added 19). I give below a copy of his letter which clearly shows his willingness to permit me to use his information as requested in my letter to him.—P. H. MELL, *Auburn, Alabama.*

MOBILE, March 13, 1896.

PROFESSOR P. H. MELL, *Dear Sir:* Your favor of the 11th came duly to hand. It gives me pleasure to return herewith your list of Leguminosæ and Rosaceæ, accord-

ing to your request, with the localities known to me in Alabama. I have added several species of these orders not mentioned by you. I am anxious to learn if any of the plants enumerated by you, and which I could not locate in the state, have been observed by you within its limits, and if you have collected any specimens of them, I shall be greatly obliged to you if you will give me the localities of such to be inserted in my forthcoming Flora of the state. Any contribution will be gladly received and I need scarcely say that due credit will be given to all whom I have to thank for their kind assistance. I remain yours very truly.

CHARLES MOHR.

[The above is an extract from a private letter from Professor Mell, only those parts being omitted which pertain to the other features of the criticism referred to. This publication has been delayed by a desire to discover the real facts in the case. The GAZETTE is glad to say that Professor Mell should be exonerated from any intention to abuse the information received from Dr. Mohr. He certainly has acted in good faith as he understands it. The GAZETTE can only add that as it has been known for a long time that Dr. Mohr has had in preparation a "Flora of Alabama" the appearance of an independent publication under the same title, and using much material obtained from Dr. Mohr, seemed to need explanation, especially as no reference to the forthcoming work of Dr. Mohr was made. It is true that the information obtained from Dr. Mohr is credited, but the more important statement concerning the use Dr. Mohr was expecting to make of his material, and that the present list was intended in no way to interfere with it, would have explained the situation. Professor Mell has worked for many years in a botanical region peculiarly rich, and there is no reason why he should not have made large contributions to our knowledge of the flora of Alabama, contributions which when substantiated by herbarium material would justify the publication of a state list contemporaneous with another prepared by a very competent botanist.—EDS.]